UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.          | FILING DATE                   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/642,879               | 08/18/2003                    | David Morrow         | WLI 1063 PUS 3318   |                  |  |
|                          | 7590 10/17/200<br>VRIGHT PLLC | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |  |
|                          | WARD AVENUE                   | CHAMBERS, MICHAEL S  |                     |                  |  |
| SUITE 2000<br>BLOOMFIELD | HILLS, MI 48304-29            | 70                   | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|                          |                               |                      | 3711                |                  |  |
|                          |                               |                      |                     |                  |  |
|                          |                               |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|                          |                               |                      | 10/17/2007          | PAPER            |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|  |  |  |  |   | ,   | Do .         |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|--------------|--|--|
| 1<br>1   |  | App  | lication No.   |   | Applicant(s)  | 7            |  |  |
| Office A - 41- to October                                |  |  | 642,879  | ,   | MORROW ET AL  |              |  |  |
| Office Action Summary                                    |  | Exar   | miner  |   | Art Unit  |              |  |  |
| • • • •  |  |  | Chambers   |   | 3711  |              |  |  |
| Period fo  | The MAILING DATE of this commu<br>r Reply  | nication appears o   | on the cover sheet   | with the co   | rrespondence ad   | ddress       |  |  |
| WHIC<br>- Exter<br>after<br>- If NO<br>- Failui<br>Any r | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE Isions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum reto reply within the set or extended period for repely received by the Office later than three months departed term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | MAILING DATE C<br>is of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In<br>imunication.<br>statutory period will apply<br>ly will, by statute, cause t | OF THIS COMMUN<br>In no event, however, may<br>or and will expire SIX (6) M<br>the application to become | NICATION.  A reply be time  MONTHS from the ABANDONED | ly filed<br>ne mailing date of this c<br>(35 U.S.C. § 133). |              |  |  |
| Status   | , , ,  |  |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| 1)[🛛   | Responsive to communication(s) fi  | led on 10 August   | 2007   | •   |   |              |  |  |
| •  | This action is <b>FINAL</b> .  | 2b)⊠ This action   |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| · ·  |  | <i>,</i> —   |  | atters, pros  | ecution as to the   | e merits is  |  |  |
| <i>,</i> —   | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |  |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| Dispositi  | on of Claims   |  |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| 4)⊠  | )⊠ Claim(s) <u>41-51</u> is/are pending in the application.  |  |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| •  | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |  |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| 5)□  | Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |  |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| 6)⊠  | Claim(s) <u>41-51</u> is/are rejected.   |  |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| 7)   | Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |  |  |   |   | ,            |  |  |
| 8)□  | Claim(s) are subject to restr  | iction and/or elect  | tion requirement.  |   |   |              |  |  |
| Applicati  | on Papers  |  |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| 9)[  | The specification is objected to by t  | he Examiner.   |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| 10) 🔲 🤈  | The drawing(s) filed on is/are   | e: a) accepted   | or b)☐ objected t  | to by the Ex  | kaminer.  |              |  |  |
|  | Applicant may not request that any obj   | ection to the drawin   | g(s) be held in abey   | yance. See  | 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |              |  |  |
|  | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including   | g the correction is r  | equired if the drawir  | ng(s) is obje   | cted to. See 37 C   | FR 1.121(d). |  |  |
| 11) 🔲 🤈  | The oath or declaration is objected  | to by the Examine  | er. Note the attach  | ned Office A  | Action or form P7   | ΓΟ-152.      |  |  |
| Priority u   | nder 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| 12) 🔲 ,  | Acknowledgment is made of a clain  | n for foreign priorit  | ty under 35 U.S.C  | ;. § 119(a)-  | (d) or (f).   |              |  |  |
| a)[  | ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:  |  |  |   | ,   |              |  |  |
|  | 1. Certified copies of the priority  | y documents have   | e been received.   |   |   |              |  |  |
|  | <ol><li>Certified copies of the priority</li></ol>   | y documents have   | e been received in   | Application   | n <b>No</b>   |              |  |  |
|  | 3. Copies of the certified copies  | of the priority do   | cuments have bee   | en received   | l in this National  | Stage        |  |  |
|  | application from the Internati   | onal Bureau (PC1   | 「Rule 17.2(a)).  |   |   |              |  |  |
| * S  | ee the attached detailed Office acti   | on for a list of the   | certified copies no  | ot received   |   |              |  |  |
|  | ,  |  |  |   |   |              |  |  |
| Attachment   | •  |  | ,. C   |   |   |              |  |  |
|  | e of References Cited (PTO-892)<br>e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (   | PTO-948)   |  | w Summary (F<br>lo(s)/Mail Date                       |   |              |  |  |
| 3) 🔲 Infom   | nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   |  | 5) D Notice o  | of Informal Pat                                       | tent Application  |              |  |  |
| Paper  | No(s)/Mail Date  |  | 6)   | ·   |   |              |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) Application/Control Number: 10/642,879

Art Unit: 3711

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by HauteStick. HauteStick discloses a hollow tube having an interior surface and an exterior surface and extending a length along a longitudinal axis between a first end and a second end wherein one of said first and second ends is operable for attachment to a lacrosse head and said hollow tube having a wall thickness defined in a plane normal to said longitudinal axis between said interior surface and said exterior surface, wherein said wall thickness varies about said longitudinal axis in said plane and includes a first range

Application/Control Number: 10/642,879

Art Unit: 3711

about said longitudinal axis of relatively thicker wall thickness and a second range about said longitudinal axis of relatively thinner wall thickness, said first range and said second range operably associated with one another whereby said hollow tube is operable to provide tactile feedback to a user of said hollow tube as to the orientation of said hollow tube in the user's hand (See NPL HauteStick pgs 1-5).

Claims 41- 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrow et al (5568925) in view of Merola (3697069) and HauteStick. Morrow discloses a hollow shaft (fig 1, 3:46-49). HauteStick discloses it is old to desire to strengthen a portion of the shaft to increase its strength for checking the user's opponent (page 4). Merola discloses an eccentric shaft (fig 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed the eccentric cross sectional shape of Merola with Morrow in order to increase the strength of the shaft for checking during play.

As to claims 42 and 43: Merola discloses a substantially constant wall thickness with a first range of at least 120-180 degrees (fig 5). Note: The specification provides no unexpected or surprising results in using limitation; therefore it is considered a design choice. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected any one of several first ranges based on the design criteria of the machines making the extruded shafts.

As to claim 44: The specification provides no unexpected or surprising results in using limitation; therefore it is considered a design choice. An eccentric shaft having a hexagonal cross sectional shape would naturally have multiple ranges of thicknesses.

Application/Control Number: 10/642,879

Art Unit: 3711

As to claim 45: Merola discloses a substantially constant wall thickness around a first and second range (fig 5).

As to claims 46-48: The specification provides no unexpected or surprising results in using these limitations; therefore they are considered design choices. The amount of eccentricity to a shaft and this wall thickness depends on the limitations of the equipment and the desires of the person designing the shaft.

As to claim 49: Morrow discloses a polygonal cross-sectional shape (3:46-49).

As to claim 50: The specification provides no unexpected or surprising results in using limitation; therefore it is considered a design choice. An eccentric shaft having a hexagonal cross sectional shape would naturally have over half the sides thicker since walls adjacent the thicker wall would have thin and thick wall segments. And thus could be counted with either the thick or thin wall segments.

As to claim 51: Morrow discloses a polygonal cross-sectional tube with adjacent sides (3:46-49). The eccentric shaft of Merola would naturally have this limitation in an octagonal shaped shaft.

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior office action have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Chambers whose telephone number is 571-272-4407. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/642,879 Page 5

Art Unit: 3711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Kim can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Chambers Examiner Art Unit 3711

October 14, 2007

EUGENE KIM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER